

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಕಾಗಾದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರಾಮನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಮುಖಾಂತರ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂತು ಉದಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿಬರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. “ಗಂಡಸಿಗೇ ಗೌರವ” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಈಗಿನ ಒಂದುವಾದಿಕೆ. ಆದರೆ ಬಹುದೂರ ಹೋಗಿಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅಂತಹವರು 12ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಹೋದರೆ ಪುನಃ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೋ ಬೇಡವೋ ಎಂಬ ಸಂತಯವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟಿನಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್, ಮತ್ತು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಗಳು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ನಾನು ಕೆ. ಬಿ. ಎಫ್. ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಸಪ್ತಮೆಂಟರಿ ಡಿಪ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಆಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯಂತೂ ಈ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದುಸಾರಿಯಾದರೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಎಳು ಮನೂದಗಳು ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯಿಂದ ಮಂಜೂರಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಲ್ಲಾ ಯಾವಾಗ, ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ವಿವರಗಳೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನೇಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ನಿಧಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಏನು ಗೋಚರವಿದೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, I will consult the Leader of the Opposition today during the recess. By-about 13th, I think the Land Reforms Bill would be over. We have a mind to take the seven Bills passed in the Legislative Council and pass them in this House. For this, there is no difference. I think, we will have to sit after the holiday for four or five days. I will discuss with the Leader of the Opposition and with the Chair and decide.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

SECRETARY.—As required under Rule 100 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Mysore High Court Bill, 1959 as amended by the Legislative Council on the 5th September 1961.

THE MYSORE LAND REFORMS BILL, 1961 AS REPORTED BY THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE CLAUSE BY CLAUSE CONSIDERATION.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the Bill will be read clause by clause. Clause 2 there is an amendment it may be moved.

†**Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).**—Sir, before I move this amendment, I should like to make one request to the Chair. These amendments have been placed in our hands just now. It appears there are various amendments tabled. It is better that some time is given to compare our amendments with the other amendments so that our work may be lessened.

Mr. SPEAKER.— Amendments were given only yesterday. Till yesterday, we went on receiving amendments and so this has happened. So far as the amendment of the Hon'ble Member is concerned, there is no worry. He can move his amendment.

Sri V. S. PATIL.— I beg to move:

“ That in item (1) (c) of sub-clause (1) after the word ‘grazing’ the words ‘and feeding’ shall be inserted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“ That in item (1) (c) of sub-clause (1) after the word ‘grazing’ the words ‘and feeding’ shall be inserted.”

†Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, the reason why I have moved this amendment is quite simple. The original wording is—‘Agriculture includes horticulture, raising of crops used by agriculturists on the land held by him or part thereof or grazing of his cattle but does not include allied pursuits or the cutting of wood only. Here grazing of cattle is meant to help the agriculturist in order to maintain the cattle required for agriculture. That is the basic idea. Grazing cattle has been included in the definition. The agriculturist grazes cattle only during the rainy season and in summer and part of winter, they are not let out for grazing. But for these two seasons, the agriculturist reserves some part of the land for cutting grass and that grass he uses for feeding his cattle during summer and part of winter. Practically for 6 to 7 months he has to feed his cattle on the grass which is cut and stored. And if we take out or do not include the land which is kept or reserved by the agriculturist for cutting grass and then making it into hay in order to feed his own cattle, then it is practically denying the right or facility that is being given to the agriculturist. I have recently read the booklet published by the Hon'ble Sri N. Rachaiah, B. A., B. L., Minister for Agriculture and Social Welfare, entitled “*Is not the Harijan Housing subsidy scheme destructive and unproductive one?*” This is a very illuminating booklet by which the subsidising scheme of Government for Housing harijans has been cancelled. Whenever the Government gives certain bits and ask people to do the rest sometimes its effects are very disastrous as in the case of this housing scheme. Similarly, if we do not allow the agriculturist to use the land for feeding his cattle throughout the year, the effects are practically the same. Because sometimes very big people cut the grass, they store the grass and sell it in the market and when the agriculturists needs it, he has to pay for it an exorbitant rate. Government has absolutely no machinery to provide fodder for the cattle of the agriculturist and so the agriculturist has to purchase at any rate which is being fixed by these big landlords or big merchants in grass. This has caused disastrous effects so far as poorer agriculturists are concerned. And that is why, when we include land for grazing of cattle of the agriculturist, we must also make a provision for the agriculturist reserving some portion of the grazing land for cutting of grass and feed his own cattle that portion also must be

(Sri V. S. PATIL)

included in this particular definition. That is the reason why, I have moved this amendment and I hope that the Hon'ble Minister who comes from the agricultural classes—not the poorer type I know. I expect he will have some sympathy with this particular amendment and accept it and the House also may be pleased to accept this amendment as it is quite essential in order to help the agriculturist in the real sense of the word.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—In moving amendment, I want to know whether the Chair is going to fix any time limit, because the Hon'ble Member in moving his amendment has given a very good discourse on grazing and fodder and agriculture is a very inviting subject to make speeches. We will not be able to get thought very quickly if you allow speeches like this.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, it is rather interesting to propose a time limit when we are discussing an important Bill. I do not think that Mr. V. S. Patil ever intended to make a discourse on agriculture. We have already put a ceiling on discussions. Five days have been fixed for amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Five days have been fixed for the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, the definition is very clear. The Hon'ble Member tries to make a distinction between lands set apart for grazing and land set apart for feeding of cattle. I know, I am an agriculturist and I am a peasant's son...not a rich peasant as Mr. V. S. Patil was pleased to suggest. On the other hand, I should say, he is a rich peasant's son. We are aware that on the land set apart for grazing purposes, grass is grown and some times cattle are allowed to graze on the land. There is no need to make that subtle distinction between grazing and feeding. If we insert these words, there will be a number of disputes and the agriculturists will have to prove whether the land is meant for feeding or grazing. The idea is to avoid as far as possible unnecessary litigation as suggested by many Hon'ble Members. Therefore, there is no difficulty at all. The agriculturists can set apart their lands, raise grass and allow cattle to graze and sometimes cut grass also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment. The question is :

“That in item (1) (c) of sub-clause (1) after the word ‘grazing’ the words “and feeding” shall be inserted.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next amendment is by Sri Karumbayya. He is not here. Next amendment is by the Hon'ble Minister himself.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, on a point of order so far as the amendment tabled by the Hon'ble Minister, is concerned. Regarding this acreage, there are several amendments given by the other Members of this House long before the Hon'ble Revenue Minister had tabled his amendment. Why these amendments have been kept back and a recently given amendment of the Minister has been put in the first.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, an amendment given on the 6th September gets priority over an amendment given notice of earlier. It is for the Hon'ble Minister to explain.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There will be ample opportunities for the members to have their say when the Minister's amendment is put before the House. It is not my intention that anybody's amendment should be shut out, but if the Minister's amendment is accepted then the others will be barred. If the Minister's amendment is lost, then they can press their amendments.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—My point is this. We had tabled amendments much earlier to the same clause with the same wording. Instead of taking them up, why is it that the Minister's amendment has been taken up first?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The Minister was the Chairman of the Select Committee, but he has given notice of amendments on the recommendations of the Select Committee. I want to know the propriety in this matter.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have two capacities, one as Minister sponsoring the Bill and the other as Chairman of the Select Committee. As Minister sponsoring the Bill I am moving the amendment in the light of the observations made by the Leader of the Opposition and others.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—He was appointed by you as Chairman of the select Committee by virtue of his being the Minister in charge. I want to know whether it is in order now for the Minister to move an amendment on the plea that he has put forward.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are two points. Rule 83 says: "In arranging amendments raising the same question at the same point of a clause, precedence may be given to an amendment to be moved by the member in-charge of the Bill." So the amendment to be moved by the mover of the Bill always gets precedence.

As regards the other point whether the member is competent to move the amendment; I do not think he is barred from moving any amendment because he is also the mover of the Bill and the mover of a Bill has the right to move amendments.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I beg to move

"That in item (7) of sub-clause (1), for the words 'twenty seven standard acres' the words 'eighteen standard acres' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in item (7) of sub-clause (1) for the words “twenty seven standard acres” the words “eighteen standard acres” shall be substituted.”

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—When the report of the Joint Select Committee was being considered several Hon'ble Members pointed out that the ceiling area is very high. Therefore, in the light of the discussion we have come to the conclusion that the ceiling area should be 18 standard acres.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it for existing holdings ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—No.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—May I know the reason why it is reduced ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Because it is more it is being reduced.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Does it refer to the future or the past ?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The intention on this side is to prescribe a higher ceiling in the case of existing holdings under personal cultivation.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—You wanted to mislead the members. We wanted to support this amendment thinking that it would apply both to the existing and the future holdings.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Though I have an amendment in my name that the ceiling should be reduced to 20 standard acres, in a way I am supporting this proposition, but I do it with a sense of great frustration. I least expected that the Revenue Minister is capable of keeping back some valuable information from this House. The whole effect of keeping the ceiling at 18 acres is taken away by their intention to make it not applicable to the existing holdings. While speaking on the question of ceiling when I said that it should be between 15 to 20 acres, some members on this side said that it should be reduced to 15 acres. This amendment defeats the very object of the Bill and the Government will be exposed to the risk of being blamed that this Bill favours the capitalists and the big landlords. Having regard to the limited area that will be available for distribution, you must not pitch the ceiling very high. That is why I asked a few questions as to what will be the total area available for distribution when the Bill is fully implemented and as one member said, having regard to the fact that the land available for distribution will be considerably reduced, the Land Reforms Bill will be a mockery and a farce. When this amendment was first seen by me I thought wise counsel had prevailed on the ruling party and the speeches made on the floor of this House by the different sections including some of the members of the ruling party had brought about a sober influence, but I am shocked to hear that the Revenue Minister is thinking of making this ceiling area not applicable to existing holdings. It makes matters

worse. I want to know what justification there is for Government to say that it should not apply to existing holdings at all. What is the object of moving this legislation? I want to ask the Minister one thing. When this Bill comes into force after the President's consent is obtained say after 2 years, in the interval will not there be *mala fide* transfers? If you allow them to go on, what will be the effect? Transfers and gifts may take place. This is an important item in the definitions which should have weighed with the Revenue Minister and the ruling party. I do not know why there is no mention about the effect of such transfers anywhere in this Bill. In what clause are they going to make out that this ceiling does not apply to existing holdings?

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Clause 63.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Most surprisingly we do not have that amendment. That is why my friend Sri V. S. Patil said that unless all the amendments are printed and placed in our hands we cannot make a study of them because one amendment has a reaction on another amendment. We do not know what amendment the Minister is going bring to Clause 63. I take the Minister at his word but I must say that this is a spurious way of trying to get the bill passed. These are the people who talk loud of a socialistic pattern of society and the reduction of inequalities of income and of opportunities. It seems fantastic to say that this 18 acres does not apply to future acquisition. I oppose this in the sense that the definition of ceilings as 18 acres should apply not only in respect of future acquisitions but also of existing holdings.

†Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I am given to understand that the Minister has meant by this amendment that it is applicable only to future acquisitions and land more than 18 standard acres will be acquired. If this is the intention with which land reforms have been brought, I wonder who would go to the rescue of the ryots and tenants. The very purpose of the bill would be defeated if only future acquisitions are sought to be restricted. According to be Minister, there will be no ceiling limit to the existing holdings. I would only draw the attention of the House to Clause 63 which should be read *vis-a-vis* the definition clause on ceiling. Does this mean that the ceiling area is applicable only to future acquisition? This means that in respect of the existing holdings a person should not be cultivating more than 27 standard acres, according to clause 63 read with the definition. If that were to be the case, I fail to understand the interpretation of the Hon'ble Minister that the 18 standard acres would hold good only to future acquisitions. If that is the case, where is the necessity for having a law of this kind if restrictions are to be placed only for future acquisitions and not existing holdings. What it means originally was to reduce the ceiling area that has been given in the definition clause to 18 standard acres. That means that no family with 5 members should have more than 18 standard acres either existing or

(Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

future. If that is the case there is no question of future acquisitions arising at all. The interpretation given by the Hon'ble Minister would not hold water for the simple reason that it upsets the entire Bill and no purpose will be served. I appeal to the Chair to consider the point that fundamentally we are defeating the purpose of the bill. What is the aim in bringing this legislation to see that no man should hold land which he cannot cultivate, either himself or through hired labour. In order to ensure that an uniform law is made in this behalf should not hold more than it can till and the surplus land should be given to the landless. The Minister said that he would be able to get 2 lakhs acres of land. But if his interpretation is allowed, where is the land available with the Minister. Does he have 30 lakhs acres of surplus land so that the tenants may be registered with occupancy rights. I appeal to the Chair and to the good conscience of every Member that the 18 acres mentioned by the Hon'ble Minister should apply also to existing holdings. I support the amendment as it is which means that the ceiling area must be limited to 18 standard acres, even in respect of existing holdings.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಫುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಮೈಸೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರೂ ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಬದ್ಧಿರುವ ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟಿನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ನನಗಾದರೂ ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಬಹಳ ಬಿಡಾರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಗಣನೀಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಡುವಳಿಯ ಪರಮಾವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಾದಮಾಡಿದವು. ಆ ವಾದವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಭೂಮಿಹೀನ ರೈತರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದವು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದರು. ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷ ಅವರ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಪ್ರಗತಿಪರವಾದ ಪಕ್ಷವೆನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮರೆಯಬಾರದು. ಈಗ ಅವರಾದರೂ ಭಾವನೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಬಹುಶಃ 27 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಇರಲೇಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದಿಂದ ವಾದಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ಜೋರಾಗಿ ನಾವೂ ವಾದಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದರು. ಯಾವಾಗ 18 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಹಿಡುವಳಿಯ ಪರಮಾವಧಿನಾಕು ಎಂದು ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟರೋ, ಅಗ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ವಾದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನು ಏನೇನು ತರಬಹುದು, ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಊಹಾಪೋಹವಾಡಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಜ್ಯೋತಿಷ್ಯ ಓದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಫುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಈ ಮನೋಧೇಯವನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಸಂಯೋಜನೆಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಓದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನಗಾದರೂ ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It seems to be your prerogative to read and not the Leader of the opposition.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಫುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಏನಾದರೂ ಕಂಡದ್ದನ್ನು ಕಂಡಂತೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಕೆಂಡದಂತೆ ಕೋಪ ಎನ್ನುವಂತೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಸಂಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ

ಕೋಪರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಏನುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಹಿಡುವಳಿಯ ಪರಮಾವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಾರ್ಯಾರು ಕಲಮುಗಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಷ್ಟು ಬೇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

16ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ Conditions restricting resumption of land under section 14 ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ resumption ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಹಿಡುವಳಿಯ ಪರಮಾವಧಿ ಯಾದ ಪ್ರಮಾಣಕ್ಕೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಬ್ ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ ಇದೆ. ನಾರ್ಯಾನೆಯ ಸಬ್ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

“(4) The right to resume land under clauses (1) to (3) shall be subject to the further condition that the land resumed from all the tenants holding under the landlord together with the extent of land, if any, cultivated by the landlord personally and any non-resumable land held by him shall not exceed three family holdings.”

ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರದಿಯರೀತ್ಯೆ 18 ಸ್ಕ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಮೂರು ಕುಟುಂಬ ಹಿಡುವಳಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. 27 ಸ್ಕ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಅಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರೆಗೆ ಕುಟುಂಬ ಹಿಡುವಳಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಳತ ಪಕ್ಷ ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ, ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರಾಧರೂ ಯಾವ ಅಂಕಿಯ ಗುರಿಯನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಧಿತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅನೇಕರು ತಮಗೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತಾವು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡರಾರದೆ, ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯನ್ನು ಮಣ್ಣು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಬಿಸಿಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಮಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಷ್ಟಪಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಗೇಣಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಸಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಜನರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಜಮೀನಿದ್ದರೂ, ತಾವೇ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೂ, ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ವಶಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಡೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ 16ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ಫ್ಯಾಮಿಲಿ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್‌ಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ವಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. 18 ಸ್ಕ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಯಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಮಿತಿ, ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. ಗೇಣಿದಾರನಿಂದ ಕೈತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಒಬ್ಬ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಲಾರ್ಡಿನ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ವಶಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. 18 ಸ್ಕ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಿಂತ ಹಾಸಿ ಜಮೀನು ವಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಲಾರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರೈತನ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ. 16ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಓದಿದರೆ, ಗೇಣಿದಾರನಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಆತನ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ವಿಷಾದವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಬಂದ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. 16ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರತಕ್ಕದು ಹಿಡುವಳಿ ಪರಿಮಿತಿ 18 ಎಕರೆಗೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಿರ್ಧರವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತೋರಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಂಗತಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಪರಿಮಿತಿ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಇರುವುದು ಕೂಡ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 16ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಪರಿಮಿತಿ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಅಂತ ಆಗಲೇ ಇದೆ. ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದ ವರದಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 2ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನ 7ನೇ ಐಟಮ್‌ಗೂ, 16ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನ 4ನೇ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿರೋಧಾಭಾಸ ಇರುವುದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಇದು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ? ಮೂರು ಫ್ಯಾಮಿಲಿ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್‌ಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಕೂಡದು.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ)

ಇದು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಈ ಮಧ್ಯೆ 63ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ 27 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೂಟನೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಿಲಿಂಗ್ ಎರಿಯಾ ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಒದಿಕೊಂಡರೆ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಅಂತ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೆ? ಯಾರು 27 ಎಕರೆಗೆ ಈಗಿರುವ ಭೂಮಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅರ್ಹರೋ, ಕಾನೂನು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಸಹಸ್ರಾರು ಎಕರೆ ಯಾರ ಒಬ್ಬನ ಹಿಡುವಳಿ ಇತ್ತೋ, ಅಂಥವರ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಉದ್ದೇಶವಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮೂಲಭೂತವಾದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇನ್ನೊಂದಿದೆ. ಸಹಸ್ರಾರು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡದೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಬರೀ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಜಮೀನಿನಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಬರಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥವನ್ನು ಭೂಮಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದರಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರತಿಫಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಯಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರತಿಫಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕವನಿಗೆ, ಭೂಮಿ ತನ್ನದು, ತಾನೇ ಆ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಮಾನ ಬರಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು, ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಉಳುವ ರೈತ 18 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಅವನ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವನ ಕೈನಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಎಕರೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ತಪ್ಪಿಪಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 14 ಮತ್ತು 16 ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಓದಿದರೆ ಈಗ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು 67ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವುದು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುವುದು ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ನಂಬಿಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೈತನಿಗೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಖುದ್ದು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೈತ 27 ಎಕರೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, 30 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರಲಿ, 50 ಎಕರೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿ, ಅವನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಕಾಣದಂಥ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾರೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ನನಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅದೃಶ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ ಅಥವಾ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ 208 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯ ರೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಾನಾದರೂ ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವುಂಟಾದರೆ, ಅವರ ಚಿತ್ತವನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಆಗ 18-27 ಎಕರೆ ಅನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನೀವು ಅಪ್ರೀತಿಯೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲರಿ.

27 ಎಕರೆ, 50 ಎಕರೆ, 100 ಎಕರೆ ತರೀ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ನಂಸಾರಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೈತ, ಇಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡ ರೈತ ಅವನ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾನೆಯೇ! ಅವನು ಬೆಳೆಗೆ ಎದುರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಫಿ, ದೋಸೆ, ಇಡ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾನೆಯೇ? ಅವನು ತಂಗಲನ್ನೇ ತನ್ನ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವನು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಂಚದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಹಾಸಿಗೆ ಹಾಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ಮಲಗುತ್ತಾನೆಯೇ? ಅವನು ಚಾಪೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ, ಮಂದಾಸನದ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಮಲಗಬೇಕು. ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಭಿಕ್ಷುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಊಟ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಅವನಿಗೆ? ಅವನ ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಆಳಿನ ಜೀವನವನ್ನೇ ಆವಲಂಬಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. 7 ತ್ತಾರು ಜನ ಅವನ ಆಳುಗಳು, ಕೂಲಿಗಳು ಏನು ಊಟ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ, ಅದನ್ನೇ ಅವನೂ ಊಟ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಗೇಣಿಯ ಪರವಾವದಿ 27 ಎಕರೆಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವ ರೈತರನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾರೂ ನನ್ನ ಹಾಗೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾರನ್ನು ಕಂದವರೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಕಾರು ಹತ್ತಿದವರೇ ಅಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೇಳಬಹುದು. ಸನ್ನಮ್ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ. ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಗಿನ ನೇರಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The only point here is, what the amendment of the Minister means.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—At this stage, the scope of the debate is limited. I have said that the general rule that the 18 standard acres will constitute the ceiling area will come at the appropriate stage. I do not know why my friends are shocked at the amendment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಅಪ್ರೋಸಿತ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಬಂದು 27 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡರು.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—We are passing through stage which is rather more important. Why should he place something which is unwarranted? Let him say who are all the members of the Opposition who went to him and requested him to let it be 27 standard acres. Let him not be silly about this thing; let him be serious.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಈ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಜೀವಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷಪಟ್ಟವರು. ನಾನಾದರೂ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವು ಇನೋಸೆಂಟ್ ರೆಫರೆನ್ಸೆಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಮೊನ್ನೆಯಿಂದ ಕಾರು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಓಡಾಡುತ್ತಿರಬಹುದು. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರಾದರೂ ನಾನು ಚಿಕ್ಕವನಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ, ಕಾರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕಾರುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಡುವವರು; ಬಟ್ಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಬಟ್ಟೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ನಡೆಸುವ ಜೀವನ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಉನ್ನತ ಮಟ್ಟದ ಜೀವನವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ನಾನು ನೋಡಿರುವುದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—‘ಹೈ ಥಿಂಕಿಂಗ್’ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಯೆಸ್, ಸರ್. ಅಫ್ ಕೋರ್ಸ್. ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ, ನನ್ನ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ, ರೈತ ಬಾಂಧವರೂ ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಸಾಲದು. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರಂತೆ ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಸೆ ಎನಗೂ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಯಾವುದನ್ನು 27 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದು ಪುರಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಏಶ್ವಾಮಿತ್ರ ಮುಖ ಹರಿಶ್ಚಂದ್ರನ ಹತ್ತಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ದಾನ ಕೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಆನೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ಕವಡೆಯನ್ನು ಎಸೆದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟುದೂರ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೋ ಅಷ್ಟುದೂರದಷ್ಟು ದ್ರವ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದು ದ್ರವ್ಯವೇ? ಭೂಮಿ ಸುಮ್ಮನೇ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರು ಭೂಮಿಗಾಗಿ ರಕ್ತ ಬೆವರು ಸುರಿಸಿ ಕಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಈ ರೈತನಿಗೆ 27 ಎಕರೆಯಷ್ಟು ಅಥವಾ 30 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ, ಆತನ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ಕಾರೇಜಿಗಾಗಲಿ, ಇಂಜನೀಯರಿಂಗ್ ಕಾರೇಜಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಮಿತಸಂತಾನ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಮಿತಸಂತಾನದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಆಗಬೇಕು, ಅದರಂತೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವನ ಸಂಸಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸೇರಿ ಉಳಿಮೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಅಂತಹವನಿಗೆ ಉನ್ನತಮಟ್ಟದ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕತ್ತಿ ಈ 27 ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಅಥವಾ 30 ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಾಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ)

ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ರೈತರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಹಾನಿ ಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈಕೊತ್ತು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವ ರೈತ ಯಾವ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಹಳಕು ಕನಿಷ್ಠವು ಎಂದು ನನಗಾ ದರೂ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರೂ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಏನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದು 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಇರಬಹುದು. 16ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಜಮೀನು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಆನೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದು 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೀರಿದರೂ ಎಂದು ಮುಂದಿನ ಪರಮಾವಧಿಯ ಈ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಯನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ.

ಹಾಗೆ ಹಿಡುವಳಿ ಇರುವ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ 27 ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಕೊನೆಯ ಹಿಡುವಳಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಗಳು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಅವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶಂಸೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾರು ಈ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ನಂಬಿಕೊಂಡು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯ ಜನರು. 27 ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್‌ಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವರು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ 27 ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟೇ ಇರಬೇಕೆ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆರೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬರು 25 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಸಾಕು ಎಂದರು. ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನೆನ್ನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಹೋದರಿಯವರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮನವರು ಪಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ವಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಸಂಪಾದನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಪುನಃ ಪುನಃ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿಲ್ಲ ಏನೂ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸಾಕಾರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಇರುವ ಈ ಬಡಪಾಯಿ ರೈತನಿಗೆ 18 ಎಕರೆಯಿಂದ 20 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡು ವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಎಂದು ಎರಡು ಎಕರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲರೂ ಅರೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಈಕೊತ್ತು ಯಾವುದರಲ್ಲೇ ನೋಡಲಿ ದ್ವಿಮುಖ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸು ತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ರೈತನಿಗೆ 3,600 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ವರಮಾನ ಸಾಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ನಾವು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಐ.ಪಿ.ಎಸ್. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಬಳ 1,800 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾಹೆಯಾನ 250 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಭತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮತಿ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮ.—ಶಂಬದಿಂದ ತೀರ್ಥ ಬೀಳುತ್ತಿದೆ. (ನಗು)

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಾಂತವು ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಯಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೇಷ್ಠ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರಿಗೆ ಮಾಹೆಯಾನ 1,500 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಸಂಬಳವಿತ್ತು. ಅವರೇನೂ ನಮಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನೇನೂ ಹಾಕಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರೆ ಪ್ರಾಂತ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡನೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ 1,800 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದರು. 1,800ಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಬಳ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಇರಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯು ತ್ತಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದರಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ

2,000 ದಿಂದ 3,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಸಂಬಳ ಇದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೂ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ 7,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಅವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಭತ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಕೇವಲ ಬಡಪಾಯಿಯಾದ ಈ ರೈತನಿಗೆ 3,600 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲು ಹೇಗೆ ಬಂತು ? ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಧೈಯುಖನೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ನಿರ್ದರ್ಶನಗಳೇ ಸಾಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದೋಷವಿತ್ತು. ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಿಯ ದಾಹ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನೂರು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಅವನ ಪಕ್ಕದ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ 50 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಮಾರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದು ಒಂದು ಭೂಮಿಯ ದಾಹ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಬಂದಿಡೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಎಷ್ಟೋಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜಮೀನುದಾರರುಗಳು ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರಾಗಿರುವವರು ಆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ಜನ ಬಂದು ನಾರ್ಕೈದು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ನನಗೆ ಬೇಡಿ, ನನ್ನವರು ಜಮೀನನ್ನೇ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ದಾಹವಿದ್ದ ಭೂಮಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಜಮೀನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಡವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ನಿಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಂತಹವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಭೂಮಿ ನಿಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬಡವರಾದವರಿಗೆ ನಿಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಂತಹ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ದೋಡನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವ ರೈತನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ, ಅವನ ಜೀವನ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಆತನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ಆರ್ಥಿಕವಲಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡದೆ ಇರುವಾಗ ಬಡಪಾಯಿಯಾದ ರೈತನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ? ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ರೈತನಲ್ಲಿ 20 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನಮಂಜನವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರು ಸ್ವಂತವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವವರಿಗೆ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ವಾಯಂಜನ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ಸಲಹೆಗಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಬಹಳ ಕೃತಜ್ಞರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet after half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I just wanted to have a clarification. When I listened to the Revenue Minister I understood him to suggest that these 18 acres will not apply to the existing holdings where the land is being cultivated personally by a landlord. That is what I thought he had said.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I said simply, if I can give out my mind at this stage that the intention appears to be on this side to enhance ceiling in the case of existing holdings under personal cultivation and that would be dealt with later on.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, under definitions the Select Committee have given certain explanations to certain definitions. For example item No. 20, 10, and others. If the intention of the Hon'ble Revenue Minister was that this ceiling area of 18 acres which he has suggested in the amendment, should apply only for future acquisitions and anything in excess should apply to the existing holdings. You could have brought that explanation under this clause also. That means you are going to bring an amendment to section 63 and we have nothing to say in regard to this particular amendment. Where is the point in your not adding an explanation to item 7 in clause 2?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is no need for adding an explanation. If you go on adding explanations there will be no end. There are certain lands which are exempted under clause 63 and so we do not specify in the definition clause that it will not apply to plantations or specialised farms or orchards, etc. Those will come under the category of exemptions.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ (ಹರಿಹರ).—ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು 27 ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟೀಕರಣ ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬದಲು 18 ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟೀಕರಣ ಎಕರೆಗಳಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಂದಿರುವ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ— If it does not refer to lands under personal cultivation, it is already made applicable to resumpting lands under clause 16. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ಸ್ವೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಆ 63ನೇ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ? ಈಗಲೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆ ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ 63ಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ನಾವು ಹೇಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು? ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಮುಂದಿನ ರಿಸಂಪ್ಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ರಾಯಂಡ್ಸ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರೆ ಇದು ಕೇವಲ ಸ್ವಂತ ಸಾಗುವಳಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಒಂದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನೀಗ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I do not know what difficulty is there? I have moved an amendment to the effect that the ceiling area will be 18 standard acres. We will proceed on that basis. At the appropriate stage if somebody says that it should not apply to coffee plantations or tea estates or specialised farms, etc., at that stage we will see. Generally the rule is that ceiling area will be 18 standard acres. I do not understand why my friends on the other side should find it difficult to understand.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I personally know that this is something which is coming up very new. I have noted down what you said that you are thinking of keeping a higher ceiling in respect of lands which

come under the category of personal cultivation which is an express of 18 acres. I want that position to be made clear. If you say so, we have got to oppose the amendment.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—At this stage all those things are not relevant. If at the subsequent stage an amendment is brought, Hon'ble Members can argue and attack bitterly. Our friends on the other side are so much worried and Troubled.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕ್ಯಾಪ್ 2 ಸರ್ವೆಕ್ಯಾಪ್ 7ಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದು ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯದಲ್ಲ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯಕರವಾದ ಮಾತೇ ಸರಿ. ಇವರ ಒಳಾಂತರವೇನೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಆ ಧರ್ಮಸ್ಥಳದ ಮೆ ಜನಾಧಿ ಹೆಗ್ಗಡೆಯವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಳಿ ರೈತರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಲು ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಆ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವೇ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನೇ ಒದ್ದಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ನನಗೆ ತುಂಬಾ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಯಿತು ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಆ ರೈತರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾದತಕ್ಕ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ನನಗೂ ಕೂಡ “ಅಯ್ಯೋ ಪಾಪ!” ಅನಿಸುತ್ತೆ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬರ್ ವಿದೆ ಇದು ಮೊದಲು ಜಿತ್ತಿ ಸಮಿತಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅಧಾರವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಾಯಿತು. ಅನಂತರ ಆ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸರಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಮೂರು ಆವಡಿಗಳು ಕಳೆಯುವವರೆಗೆ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನುಮ್ಮನಿದ್ದು ಈಗ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಗತಿಸಿ ಹೋದನಂತರ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವೆನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ನೆನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಕೂಡ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನರರ ದಿನ್ಯ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ನನಗೆ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೊಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಲು ನೆನ್ನೆ ಸಹ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶವಿತ್ತು. ಅವೆಲ್ಲ ಕಳೆದನಂತರ ಈಗ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿವರಣೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂತ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಆ ಪಾಯಿಂಟರ್ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಈಗ ಅದಕ್ಕಿನ್ನು ಕಾಲ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಈಗ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇವರ ಒಳ ಆಂತರಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದೇ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರ ವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದನಂತರ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹಿಂದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಜನರ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟು ಜನರನ್ನು ಮೆಚ್ಚಿಸಲು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಹಾಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಹೋರಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿ ಜನ ಮೆಚ್ಚುಗೆಪಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ನಾನೂ ಒಬ್ಬ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಜನ ಮೆಚ್ಚುಗೆಗಾಗಿ ಹೋರಾಟ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವವರು ನಾವೋ ಆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೋ ಯಾರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಜನರೇ ಅರಿತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ನಾವು ಈ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ತೊಯ್ಯಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾದರೂ ಅದೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ನನಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರೆ ನಾನು ಆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲೊಬ್ಬನಾಗಿದ್ದೆ. ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ನಡೆಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಒಂದು ತಪ್ಪಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ಭಯ ನನಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆವಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈಗ ತಿಳಿಸಲು ನಾನು ತಯಾರಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಈಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂತ ಒಂದು ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಬೇರೆ ಹೇಳಲು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ನ್ಯಾಯ ? ಇದು ಸರಿಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿರಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಬೇಡ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಲ್ಲವರು, ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕವರು. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಅವರ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಓದಿದವನಲ್ಲ. ಕೇವಲ ಕಾನೂನು ಓದಿಮತಿಸರ ಸಮೂಹದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತಾಗ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಷ್ಟಿಷ್ಟು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದವನೇ ಹೊರತು ಅಭ್ಯಾಸಮಾಡಿ ಅವರ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಲಿತವನಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ for the words “27 standard acres” words “18 Standard Acres” ಎಂತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂತ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದು future ಆಕ್ಟಿವಿಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಈಸರೆಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಯ ಎವರವಾಗಿ ವಾದಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ನಾವು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆರೋಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ತಿಳಿಯದಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಸಮಜಾಯಿಸಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಂದ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಡೆಪುಟಿ ಕ್ಲಾಂಪಿನ್ 27 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳಂತರೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಆಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ 27 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಇಷ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕಂತರೇ ಅಥವಾ ಅದು ಏನೂ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಇದರ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂತರೇ ಏನು ಈ ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀನೆ ? ಈಗ ನಾವು ಈ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅನಂತರ ಕ್ಲಾಂಪಿನ್ 14 ಮತ್ತು 63 ಆ ಎಂಪನ್ನಾ ಹೋಲಿಸಿ ಓದಿದರೆ ಏನು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಈಗಿನವರಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಥವಾ ಮುಂದಿನವರಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ 27 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಕ್ಲಾಂಪಿನ್ ಆಧಾರವ ಮೇಲೆ ಉಳಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ ? ಈ 27 ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕ್ರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಈ 18 ಎಕ್ರೆಗಳ ಒಂದೂ ವತಿಯಿಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ 18 ಎಕ್ರೆ ಇಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ 27 ಎಕ್ರೆಗಳೆಂಬ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಇದು ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲದ ಪಾದವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕ್ಷೀಣಿರುವಾಗ ಒತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಈ 18 ಎಕ್ರೆಗಳ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೋಂದನ್ನು ಎವರವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಭೂಪಾಲಕರು ಸುಖಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ಭೂಪಾಲಕರಿಗೂ ಈ ಸುಖಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಂಟಾಗ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಸಾಧಕ—ಭಾಧಕಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ದೈತರಿಗೆ ತುಂಬಾ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ; ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ 27 ಎಕ್ರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಮುಂದಿನ ಆಕ್ಟಿವಿಟಿ ಆಫ್ ಹೊಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಆನ್ವಯಿಸಿದ್ದೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ಲೇಷಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ದೇಶದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕರ್ಯಾಣವಾಗುವುದಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾನು ಕೂಡ

ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ನನ್ನ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಲ್ಲದೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ವಿವರಣೆ ಗ್ರೆರು ಹಾಜರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕವನಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ತರು ಹೊರಟಮೇಲೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಅನೇಕ ನಮಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಗೊಂದಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೇಕೆ ಈ ಗೊಂದಲಗಳ ಗೋಜು ಎಂತ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ? ಈಗ ಇವರು 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಹಾಕಿ ಡೆಪಿಂಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ 27 ಎಕರೆ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದು ಸು ಯಾವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದೊಂದೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಟದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ನಿಮಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಕಷ್ಟವೇನು ಹೇಳಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಎನ್ನೇನೋ ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರ ಜುಲುಮಿಗೆ ವಸನೋತು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲೋಧಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರ ಸಮಾಧಾನಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ತಿಮ್ಮಪಡಿ ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇದು ಏನು ಮಾತು!

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಮುಂದೆ ಇದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮವೇನು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈ 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಕಡೆಯತನಕ ಒಂದೇ ಅಗಿವ್ವರೆನ್ನುವುದು ನಮಗೂ ಸಂತೋಷವೇ. ತಾವು ಇವತ್ತೆಂದು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲೇನೇಷನ್ ಕಾಡಬಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಮುಂದೆ ಇದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ತಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is the speech of Sri. Puttaswamy that has troubled us.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have tabled an useful amendment suggesting that the ceiling area should be reduced to 18 standard acres. That was the suggestion of several Hon'ble Members. The question now put is: what we are going to do in the case of holdings of personal cultivation on the appointed day. We will consider it at the appropriate time.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—We have read in the newspapers that the Congress party has decided that future acquisitions should be 18 acres and existing holdings should have a ceiling of 27 acres. We want to know the position.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Am I not entitled to read this amendment in relation to Clause 63 to which this definition really applies.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are now considering clause 2 and only amendments to this clause may be commented upon.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—My suggestion is that this amendment may be taken along with amendments to clause 63. One is connected with the other.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They may or may not be. At this stage we cannot take up clause 63. May be it is the intention of Minister to apply 18 standard acres in respect of existing holdings also. How can we anticipate? I am now concerned only with clause 2 and the amendments to it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟೇ ವಿವರಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ ನಾವಿನ್ನೂ ಕತ್ತಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೇನಾದರೂ ಇದರ ಒಳ ಸಂದರ್ಭವನ್ನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಏನೋ ಅದೂ ಕೂಡ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂತ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ವಿವರಣೆ ನಮಗಂತೂ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಒಳಸಂದರ್ಭವಲ್ಲ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಡಿ. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅದೂ ಸಹ ನಿಜವೇ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಅದು ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನೇನಾದರೂ ಆ ಸರಕೆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದೊಂದಾಗಿ ಬಾಯಿ ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರ ಬಣ್ಣವೂ ಕೆಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಏಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅವರ ಕೆನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಏನೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಲ್ಲಾ? ಇದೊಂದರಿಂದಲೇ ಅವರ ಅವತಾರವೇನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಎದ್ದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅವತಾರವೂ ಕೂಡ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ನೋಡುತ್ತೇ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಈ ಅವತಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದರಿಂದಲೇ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವಿನ್ನೂ ಉಳಿದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಹಾಗಿರಲಿ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವಾದರೂ ಏನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ? ಸರ್ಕಾರವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಾತು ತ್ರವ ಕಾನೂನು ಸರಿಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲವೋ, ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ ಎಂತ ಬೇಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕೂಗು ಕಿವಿಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಬಲವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರ ಫಲವನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಅವರು ಅನುಭವಿಸಲೇ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. (ಈ ಒತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭದ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಮಾನ ಹಾರಾಟದ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಶಬ್ದ ನಭೆಗೆ ಕೇಳಿಸುತ್ತಿತ್ತು) ಕೇಳಿ, ಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಶಬ್ದವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ-ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯನೀತಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮೇಲಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಶಬ್ದವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅದು ಹಾಗಲ್ಲ—ನೀವು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಆ ಶಬ್ದ ಬರಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತಿದೆ!

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪ್ರತಿದಿನವೂ ಈ ವೇಳೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆ ಶಬ್ದ ಆಗುತ್ತಲೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅದೇಕೋ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಗಮನ ಅತ್ತಕಡೆಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದಿದೆ. ಆದರೇನೂ ಅಂಥ ಎಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಆದರೆ ನಾವೀಗ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ್ದಿಷ್ಟೇ: ಅವರೇನೇ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಲಿ—ಅದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸರ್ವ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಯಾಗುವಂತಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕು. ಅವರು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರತಕ್ಕ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಎಂಬ ಅದು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವರಿಗೂ ಸಮಾಧಾನವನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗಿರಲು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಾರೂ ಏನೇನು ನುಚ್ ನುಚ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಅವರು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಸಲಹೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾವೀಗ ಅವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೇಕೋ ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಕೊಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇನೂ ಇವರು ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೃತ್ಯುನಂದ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಗುಣಗಳು ಅವೆಲ್ಲರಲಿ ಎಂತ ನಾನು ಅತಿಶಯಿಸಿ. ಅವರು ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಉನ್ನತ ಧೈರ್ಯಗಳೂ ಉಚ್ಚ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕೇ

ಹೊರತು ಕೀಳು ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿಯಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ಅಂಶ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮನವಟ್ಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅವರು ಪಾರ್ಷ್ವಯೋಜನೆಯ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ನೀಡಿ-ಅವರು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಕೈ-ಕೈ ಹಿಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಯುದ್ಧದಿಂದಾಗದ್ದು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅಳುಕು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬಂದು ಕೈಹಿಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಯಿತು ? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಬಿಗಿಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ನೀಡ ಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು-ಪಾರ್ಷ್ವಯೋಜನೆಯ ದಾಕ್ಷಿಣ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಬಾರದು ಎಂತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅವರ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಾನಂತೆ ನಡೆಯಲು ಅವರ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳಿವೆ; ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಷ್ವಯೋಜನೆಯ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಇದು ಹಿಡಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ-ಗೃಹ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಂತೂ ಕೇಳುವುದೇ ಬೇಡ.

4- 00 P.M.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಎರಡೂವರೆ ಗಂಟೆಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿರುವ explanation ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೇನು ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅನೇಕ ಜನ ಸ್ವಹಿತರಿಗೆ ಹಿಡಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಒತ್ತು ಕಮಿಷನರಿಂದ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಪವಿತ್ರವಾದುದಾದರೂ ನೀವು ತಂದಿರುವ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಒಂದುಕೆಲಸ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ, ತಮ್ಮ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗದೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ, ಭೂಮೀನರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ನಿಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗ ಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು; ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕೇಳಿ. ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ನಂಬಿಕೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ಕೆಲಸ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಶಾಸನದ ಕಡತಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಿಸಿದಂಥ ಡಿರೀಕ್ಟ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಕೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ? ಭೂಮಿವಳಿಯ ಪರಮಾಧಿ 27 ಎಕರೆಗೆ ಬದಲು 18 ಎಕರೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಇದು future acquisitionಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ಅಥವಾ existing holdingsಗೆ ಸಹ ಅನುಮತಿಯಿತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಹಿಡಿದಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಂದೇ ನಮೂನೆಗಾಗಿರ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕಾನೂನುಮಾಡಿ ಇವೇತ್ತು 27 ಎಕರೆ, ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವವರು ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಯಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಪುಷ್ಪಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆದರೂ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರುಗಳು, ಡಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಗಬಾರವೇ ? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳಂತೆಯೇ ಅವರೂ ಸ್ಕೇಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಕಾರ್ಪಸ್, ಮೌಂಟ್ ಕಾರ್ಪಸ್ ಕಾರ್ಪಸ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಬೇಡವೇ ? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ; ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವವರು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಪದವಿಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇ ? ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಓದಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪೂರ್ವಜರು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ತರತರಾಂತರದವರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವಂತೆ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಪ್ರತಿ ನಿಮಿಷಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ತಿರುಪ್ಪವಿಡುವುದು ತಂದು ತಿರುಪ್ಪವಿಡ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರತ್ತೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ನೀತಿ, ಧೋರಣೆ ಇವರ ರಾಜ್ಯಾದಳ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ಮಾನವಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ತರುವಂಥದಲ್ಲ. 12 ಎಕರೆಗೆ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಮೂರೂವರೆ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕಲಹ, ಯಾದವರಿಗೆ ಕಲಹವಿದೆ ಹಿಡಿದಿಡಿದು, ಇವೊತ್ತು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಕಡಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಿಸುವಾಗ ಮನ ಬಂದಂತೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರ್ವಧಾ ದೋಷವಲ್ಲ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಸೂಕ್ತ ಸಮಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಸಿಲಿಂಗ್ ಎನ್ನುವ ಪದ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಗೌರಿ ಅರ್ಧ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಕೆ ಕಮಿಷನರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಒಮ್ಮತದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಇವತ್ತು ತಂದಿರುವ ಸೂಚನೆ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ; ಇದನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ರವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY(Coondapur).—To say that I was shocked is too mild a term as my friend the Leader of the Opposition has just now said. I do not know where the idea of dual ceiling for lands has cropped up, because till now we have had no occasion to discuss or consider the idea of present ceiling or future ceiling. It is not giving away any secret if I say that at no time did we consider the case of future ceiling in the Select Committee. My friend Mr. Puttaswamy like a very good lawyer had a bad case to argue. He mentioned clause 7, I believe, where the land lords are allowed to resume only 18 acres. How that can be considered to be a ceiling, how he argued that at the time we fixed the ceiling of 18 acres for land lords to resume, we had future ceiling in view, I am unable to understand. He made a very splendid speech, but if I may say so, it is out of place here; it has nothing to do with the ceiling proposed to be fixed just now. When I say that I was shocked I meant it. There was something to hide here. I felt there was a sense of guilt, a guilty conscience because we thought that ceiling meant ceiling for the present because practically it is not far our grand-children that we are making this law only. Because there is so much cry that there should be a land reform now, that there should be a ceiling on the holding of land, that there should be a reasonable compensation and so many other things, the land reform is sought to be enacted. As one of my friends said, it has been published that the ruling party has decided to have 27 acres for ceiling. I am not surprised at it. It is the recommendation of our own Select Committee. Because there was a suspicion that something has been hidden under it, there is a snag somewhere, some of us put a question, does it apply to present ceiling or future ceiling. There was a sort of hesitation on the part of the Minister. I do not accuse him personally because he is sought to be a prisoner. He was unwilling to express himself because sincerity would have expected any one to say that ceiling means as is sought to be said in the Bill. What does it say in the Bill? Mr. Puttaswamy sought the help of clause 7. Clause 7 does not say anything about future ceiling. It only says that where a landlord wants to cultivate the land in the possession of the tenant, there should be a ceiling of his right to resume the land. That ceiling applies to persons who cultivate land. 27 acres does not apply to land lords at all. 27 or 211 acres in North Kanara applies to persons who are actually in possession of the land so that when the Minister wanted to have a definition of 18 acres for ceiling, we thought it applies to persons at present. Why did he hide that issue at all. Because as I said, a sense of guilt attaches to this amendment. The Government in this

particular case want to announce that they will abide by the recommendation of the Planning Commission. It was expressed yesterday that the Government would follow the recommendations of the Planning Commission.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I said that we would consider it.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.— I put a question to the Minister and he said that we will follow the Planning Commission.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I am definite about it. With regard to ceiling I said that the Planning Commission have recommended that the ceiling should be reduced or have said that 18 acres would be ceiling. I said that we will consider.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.— The Planning Commission never contemplated that you should pass an amendment to the effect that in future the ceiling should be fixed at 18 acres ; that is not the intention of the Planning Commission at all. I shall read the recommendation of the Planning Commission :

“.....the Committee felt that the ceiling was high.....”
The recommendation is “.....That it should be brought down to the level provided in the Hyderabad law as applicable to the Karnatak area.....”

Had the Revenue Minister ever discussed about this with the Planning Commission that there should be 18 acres for future acquisition ? Unless Clause 16 is amended properly. It will have no meaning at all. My friend suggested that they are going to amend Clause 63. We do not know what amendment is going to be brought to clause 63. It looks that the Government have made up their mind that the present ceiling should be 27 standard acres and the future ceiling should be 18 standard acres. But, they are not yet clear about their amendment to Clause 63.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGAM.—Ceiling means 81 acres for the present holding; where is the doubt ?

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.— Sir, this is how anybody would get himself confused.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Much water has already flown; probably, he was not here.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, the Revenue Minister was very careful and rather parsimonious when he spoke. He wanted to escape all criticisms. We all know the Revenue Minister is an honest gentleman.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, my amendment does not deserve that remark. In a straight forward manner I have said that the ceiling should be 18 acres. When a question was put whether it applies to the existing holdings, I said that all that matter can be taken later on.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, we never expected to be misled in this manner.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I never try to mislead.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Possibly, you did not do that. But, that is the effect; we were misled. That is why I wanted to clarify whether this 18 acres ceiling was for the present holdings. My friend Sri Puttaswamy made a very long speech. To say the least, it is a political speech. The speech had nothing to do with the amendment. He took occasion to attack the opposition and said that his party was of a more progressive view. He had occasion to comment on the dress, on the car used and the standard of life of the Leader of the Opposition. Of course, there is liberty of speech, but this is not the way. We shall not quarrel about the progressive nature of our proposals or your proposals. I myself do not quarrel on the point that 27 standard acres would be enough for a family to live in the style the Leader of the Opposition lives or my friend Mr. Puttaswamy lives. If the Government had come forward with a clean straight forward proposal to stick to the proposal of the Select Committee, we had no quarrel. Sir, we, ourselves, have not proposed a revolutionary ceiling. In our desecuting note that 20 acres would be a reasonable and fair ceiling. So, there is not much difference between our suggestion and the amendment of the Revenue Minister. But, because this point is raised now and it is not raised in a straight forward manner, we object to it. Even now we stick to 18 acres as a fair extent. We are prepared to withdraw all our amendments provided you agree that 18 acres applies to the ceiling as it is contemplated in the Bill. It appears that a separate ceiling is contemplated with regard to the present holdings and the future holdings. Then clause 63 will have no meaning. The meaning sought to be implied in the amendment is not at all in the Bill. It has to be incorporated in the Bill now. It was never contemplated in the Select Committee. It is a new thing and it is because the Government wants to show to the Planning Commission that they have followed their recommendations. Possibly, I do not know whether those gentlemen have tampered with the whole Bill.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Let us not comment on the Planning Commission.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, the recommendation of the Planning Commission is not such a sacred thing that I have no right to comment on that. I am entitled to comment as well as praise them whenever it is praise worthy. As I see, this definition is also meant to mislead the Planning Commission, because they may not be able to see implication. I request the Government to put all their cards before the House and let not something be hidden behind the screen. There is no uniformity between these amendments. At a certain stage, we should not be taken by surprise. Sir, we are trying to have a practicable type of legislation to help a section of the people if not all the people. With

all the respect, I must say that this is not the way. I take exception to the way in which the amendment is moved and the way it is supported by the Members on the other side and the way in which the opposition is tried to be decried. If this is sought to be done again and again, we also know how to do it and let us not repeat that performance of attacking this person or that. Sir, I once again suggest that the Government may put all the cards before the House. Let us know all their amendments for different clauses.

The Hon'ble Chair was pleased to say just now, 'let us wait till we reach clause 63. I submit to the Chair I am unable to see that point. Why should wait till that time? We do not know that. As I said, my friends on this side are unable to accept the view point of the Government regarding the implied meaning. Regarding express meaning I am in full agreement. The only thing is, I am afraid of the hidden hand. Let us be frank. Let us place all the cards before the House. We are prepared to trust each other. Government is not willing to place all its cards before us. That is my objection, not to the 18 acres as such. If the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue is prepared to reduce it to 12 acres, we are prepared to agree. Why not place all the cards before us? Let us know it. Therefore Sir, I even suggest that this amendment be even withheld till all the amendments are before the House. Let us read this amendment in the light of the proposed amendment to Clause 63.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In a matter like this, I least expected that. When these 18 cases came before us, we were all very happy that even without discussion, we would have accepted that amendment. But when I heard these long speeches and abjectionable speeches, I had to change my mind. I think it is the most provocative speech ever made on the Government side. Even I would suggest that consideration of Clause 2 may be taken up later and we can go to other clauses.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But I will tell them that guillotine will be applied at the end. Members have agreed to five days limit. I am not in any way stiffling the debate. It is not my intention to stifle the debate. But they should please remember that at the end of fifth day, whatever other amendments remain will be guillotined.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—By suspending the rule, we can give ourselves two more days.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That remedy is always open. He may make a motion and if it is carried, we will have an extension of the time.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I cannot make a motion. I know it will be defeated. I leave it to the Minister or the Chair to make the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have only power to extend by one hour. He has made the position quite clear. The Leader of the Opposition and Sri V. S. Patil also have spoken about the position. They have also made the position clear. What is there to speak further? I do not think he can add anything more.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—This is a very important matter. The question of ceiling is one that has figured prominently in the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have no objection if he wants to discuss clause 2 till the end of tomorrow. But it is my duty to warn the members that if at the end of the fifth day, I put the rest of the clauses to the guillotine they should not blame me.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—We only request the Chair to make the other amendments available.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If the Government is so keen on getting through in such hurry, we will refrain from participating. You can carry on. There is not even an attitude of co-operation. There is no mood to take the opposition into confidence even when a reasonable apprehension is put forward. We may be wrong. But it is up to the Hon'ble Minister in charge of the Bill to clear that apprehension. Please let me know in respect of which other Bill have the amendments been supplied piece-meal like this? I do not find fault with the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Most of the amendments come from the Opposition. There are very few amendments from the Treasury Benches. Whatever amendments have been tabled, they are not too difficult to understand. It may be open to criticism.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The most important section is section 63. We have got amendments supplied only upto clause 42.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Most of the amendment are from the Opposition. I am prepared to allow the amendments to be moved out up to clause 42. I do not know what amendments would be coming up for consideration after clause 42 is put to vote.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What I say is having regard to this difficult situation, we will take the subsequent sections now and take up clause 2 afterwards.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After spending so much time on this clause, we cannot put it off like that. Members have a right to ask the Government about their intentions in regard to any clause and if the Government gives any reply, they have to accept it.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—There should be sufficient time because this is a very substantial amendment which introduces very many complicated questions in respect of other other clauses. It is not an ordinary amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do realise that. If members want a full-dress discussion, I have absolutely no objection.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—This amounts to curtailing our liberty.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Every one of them will be given a chance, but they will find themselves cornered at the end.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—My point is that the time for discussion of the clauses should be extended and sufficient time should be given to the discussion of this amendment as it is a very important one having bearing on the other clauses.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—You were kind enough to fix 3 P.M. on Monday as the last date to give amendments. So far as we have got amendments up to Clause 42 only.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have other amendments also.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Unless we get all the amendments to the other clauses also it is not possible to know whether we should take part in the discussion on this amendment. So let us adjourn and meet to-morrow when we get all the amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The difficulty is that the press could not print all the amendments within the allotted time, I have received the amendments.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Suppose all the persons who have given notice of these amendments up to Clause 42 are absent, what would have happened? Would you have not proceeded with the amendments to the other clauses? Therefore, I say without having all the amendments in our hands it is not possible for us to discuss the amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members are entitled to ask for all the amendments. The amendments will be ready by to-morrow because they could not be printed in time. Since we are considering Clause 2 we have to restrict ourselves to Clause 2.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Clause 2 has a bearing on Clauses 32, 33 and 63; so we must have the amendments to those clauses also before us.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already said that we are considering Clause 2 and therefore we have to restrict ourselves to the amendments to Clause 2. If they say that it has a bearing on some other clause, then that clause also they can discuss. That should be an end of the matter.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Let us adjourn now and meet to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No. We will not adjourn. If necessary, I am prepared to sit up 8 O'Clock to-day.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—We are not able to know what amendments are going to be moved to Clauses 63 and 64.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He is unnecessarily creating complication.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—When we are asking for all the amendments, you say that we are unnecessarily wasting the time.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—This is not the first time that amendments come piecemeal. On various occasions even at the time of voting some of our friends have moved amendments and this House and the Chair have accepted them. I cannot understand this attitude on the part of the Hon'ble Members. The amendment is before the House and it is for the House either to pass it or to reject it.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—That is not the challenge we are throwing. This happens to be an important Bill which will revolutionize the land system. So it is necessary that we should know what all amendments are going to come.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The amendment is before the House. Let it be voted.

†Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—Government have introduced this amendment with a view to limiting the ceiling to 18 standard acres. I would not have risen to express my views on this amendment. If I had seen the reasons for moving this amendment. Different reasons had been given on different occasions for fixing different ceilings. The reason given in the Jatti Committee Report was different from the reason given in the original Bill. Then the ceiling fixed by the Joint Select Committee was different and a different reason was given for that. Now the Minister wants to fix a different ceiling. There appears to be something embarrassing the mind of the Government and they do not want to express it. I have heard with great attention the reasons advanced by various members to come to this conclusion, but their reasons are not at all convincing because on different occasions they have given different reasons and arrived at different conclusions. When we consider this question we must bear in mind the constitutional provision contained in Article 39(c) which says that the State has to see that there is no concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment. This Bill has been introduced with the intention of implementing this provision of the Constitution and its aim is that the disparity in income between the individuals in society is reduced to the minimum. If this aim is lost sight of, then there is no basis for this Bill. It only amounts to this that where reason fails abuses begin. In order to avoid all conflicts, we should try to implement this constitutional provision and see that the disparity income is reduced to the minimum. In the words of an economist we should see that "wealth and means of production are not concentrated in the hands of a few to the common detriment." The main point to be considered is whether this bill is in consonance with such an objective. With what intention is this reform being brought about ?

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I am rising on a point of order. I am referring to Rule 81 (d) :

“If an amendment refers to, or is not intelligible without a subsequent amendment or schedule, notice of the subsequent or schedule shall be given before the first amendment is moved, so as to make the series of amendments intelligible as a whole.”

So far as this amendment is concerned, it is not intelligible. Secondly the schedule to the bill gives our certain figures of categories of standard acres and these have been worked out on the basis that the ceiling would be 27 standard acres. Since the present amendment reduces ceiling to 18 acres, the schedule is wrong and therefore unintelligible. This amendment affects Clauses 63, 64, 32 and 33 and if those clauses are not simultaneously amended or such amendments made known to us in advance, the whole thing becomes unintelligible. Therefore I request that this amendment be not allowed.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Sir, my friend's argument is perfectly correct. You have become aware of this rule now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is perfectly incorrect. They may please tell me in what way this amendment refers to a subsequent amendment. It does not refer to any subsequent amendment at all. The amendment only says that instead of the ceiling being 27 acres, it shall be 18 acres. Therefore the amendment is by itself intelligible and there is no question of this amendment referring to a subsequent amendment. After this is passed, let us see what happens.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Rule 81 deals with the admission of amendments. If the Hon'ble Revenue Minister even at this stage will kindly tell us that he has got an amendment to Clause 63 I shall then talk on the point raised by Mr. Arumugham.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have made it clear several times. I do not know why the Opposition should make a big fuss of this matter.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—We are making very little fuss, atleast not as much as you are making. The definition of ceiling states what is the extent of standard of acres necessary to constitute the ceiling. There can be only one type of ceiling. Now it emerges that there are two types of ceilings and we want to know how the two are distinct.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will come to that at the appropriate time. Now we are considering Clause 2. He may please read Rule 83 :

“Amendments of which notice has been given shall, as far as practicable, be arranged in the list of amendments, issued from time to time.....”

ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ subsequent amendmentಗಾಗಲಿ
ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್‌ಗಾಗಲಿ refer ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—How do you know that it would be a future amendment ?.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given a ruling. If the Hon'ble Member wants to challenge it, I should like to state that he cannot.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—All right, Sir. We will yield but this does not do credit to the Treasury Benches.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I was referring to the axiom that the wealth and the means of production should not be concentrated in a few hands. But this would not mean that redistribution of the existing wealth should be done in such a manner as to distribute poverty.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may please confine his remarks to the amendment.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—That is what I am doing. They are thinking of imposing ceilings and distributing the surplus land. In distributing land, Government should ensure that a person functioning in the agricultural field would have enough to have a normally decent living. I am not worried whether the ceiling much or less but what should be ensured is that the peasant has enough lands from which he could get income to feed himself and his family, educate his children etc. That is the basic principle. The population of the country is increasing. Enough land should be found for these people. Redistribution of land should be in such a manner that everyone would have an assured standard of life. I do not know the measures contemplated by the Government to achieve this objective. I do not know whether this legislation is intended.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ನಿಲಂಗೆ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—What is the idea of fixing the ceiling at 18 acres. The various reasons advances is not in consonance with the spirit of the Constitutional provisions. I want to ask whether you are going to introduce the same ceiling limit in other sectors of society....

What is the basic principle on which the Select Committee have proposed 27 standard acres as the standard and what is the basic principle on which you are reducing the ceiling to an extent of 18 acres. Honourable Member Sri Srinivasa Shetty has already expressed an apprehension as to whether this amendment applies to the present holding or the future. That is not made clear. What are the various arrangements that you intend making in the society so that people who are considered to be agriculturists should have agriculture as a side occupation and they may also engage themselves in other occupations so that the disparity between man and man is reduced and at the same time their income is sufficient to make them live in a standard way.

†Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—The cardinal principle of legislative philosophy is to embody in the Statute Book the intention of legislators in more

clear and simple terms; but when most of my friends asked the Revenue Minister who has piloted this Bill, he has been silent. When we are dealing with such a legislation which has got a marvellous effect on the masses of the people, the Government must be clear. Unless in the beginning itself the point is made clear, the Honourable Members will not be able to express their view points. Now this amendment sent by the Minister for Revenue contemplates only 18 standard acres. But it is not in conformity with the definition. In the definition Clause 27 standard acres is mentioned. When asked, the Revenue Minister says that he is going to reveal it at proper stage. But by this statement I am sorry I have inevitably to infer that there is some trick concealed so as to play it at a proper stage. When we are passing this law for the benefit of the people and particularly for the benefit of agricultural class, why should he hide this?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—When the Opposition members table an amendment, I don't ask them the secret behind it; I don't attribute motive behind the amendment.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The inference is obvious that we will never hide anything, we are more open door unlike the Congress.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Why should he take the credit. We can also do the same thing.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—We have defined ceiling area to mean a land which is equal to 27 standard acres. Now what we want to know is whether it would apply to existing holders or for future acquisition. If you make this point clear at this initial stage, I do not think there will be any room for misinterpretation of the spirit of the Government. Therefore, I urge the Government, and the Minister to make this point clear at this stage itself so as to avoid unnecessary confusion or unnecessary waste of time. I submit that this amendment is quite inconsistent with the spirit of the definition and inconsistent with the spirit of the provisions embodied in Clauses 14, 16 and 63. Therefore, I feel that this amendment is not free from motive, is not free from trick and I strongly appeal to the Government to make the point clear at the initial stage itself. After all, when we are passing this very sanctioned piece of legislation, the intention of the legislators must be clearly stated in the Statute Book. Therefore it is better that the Revenue Minister will get up and say that his intention is this or that. Unless he does it, I am afraid it is very difficult to advance our view points. When the Revenue Minister is reluctant to come out with the truth behind it, I have reiterate that there is some trick. Let us not play any trick when passing this land reform legislation. This legislation is meant to better the economic condition of the rural population. Such being the case, I do not know why the Minister is reluctant to come out with the truth or the significance of that.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The Minister for Revenue tried to explain very clearly. If the Hon'ble Member is not able to understand, what can we do.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—Why should you hide things from the Hon'ble Member of this House? When they have not made available all the amendments sent by the Honourable Members, to-day, it is very difficult to know as to what they would say with regard to Clause 63 or Clause 14 or Clause 16. I feel that this amendment is not proper; it is not free from any motive or trick. Therefore, it is better that the Minister will either withdraw the amendment or get up and say what his intention is. Because we cannot drive the people to go to the court of law to confuse the Judge or the client or the public. Because we have read in papers that with regard to existing holdings, 27 standard acres will remain as it is embodied in the Bill. With regard to future acquisition, it will be 18 standard acres. If that is so, the Minister can get up and say that it applies only for future acquisition. Therefore, I feel that this amendment is to be taken back or the Minister must get up and say that it applied to 18 acres.

†Sri V. S. PATIL—Sir, much of the time or to-day's time is taken up by this clause or by this amendment. I do not want to get myself much more entangled in the controversy. In my dissenting note I had already proposed that "the proposed ceiling is too high. No family of Five Members can ever cultivate such a big area efficiently. This ceiling will perpetuate social injustice and continue the meagre production as it is now. Hence ceiling should be only three family holdings at the most." According to the present amendment that has been brought by the Hon'ble Minister, it corresponds with the dissenting note which I had given to the report of the Select Committee. I have also moved an amendment to this sub-clause in which I have suggested 15 acres rather than 27. I will read a paragraph on page 20 of the Jatti Committee report which runs as follows :

"In Japan the 1946 Owner-Farmer Establishment Law has transferred nearly 80 per cent of all tenant land to owner occupancy and 92 per cent of the land is now held by owner farmers. Under this law the Japanese Government was commissioner to buy the bulk of all land holdings above 2.45 acres owned by absentee landlords and above 7.35 acres held by owner-cultivators."

That means, in Japan the ceiling is fixed at 11.35 acres of land and we all know that the best and the highest yield per acre is in Japan. It is because the holdings are restricted to a certain area wherein a cultivator can put in all his energy, all his labour and all the means in that area. The average yield in India is about 1000 lbs. Of paddy per acre whereas in Japan it is 8,000 lbs. Sir, in our country we have tried this Japanese method of cultivation of paddy and in my own field I have raised up to 8000 lbs. per acre. This can be done

elsewhere also. If we resort to intensive cultivation we can do this. But what has happened now is, our landlords want to simply extend their lands but not take up intensive cultivation. We cannot expand the area because all the land that is cultivable is under cultivation. So, it is very necessary that there must be restriction and it must be even brought down to a lower level. We can learn from the experience of the Japanese. Japan is not a communist country. The point is, they are getting much more average yield per acre than any other country in the world because of the intensive cultivation. So, the amendment moved by the Hon'ble Minister will have to be accepted, because it cannot be brought down further under the present circumstances. I have proposed 15 acres But, this cannot be further brought down because most of the ruling party Members come from this particular class of people having landed property and they do not want to see that their holdings are reduced. I think even this 18 acres is fixed with great pressure from the party. I wish that it is reduced from 27 to 18 acres. I must remind the Hon'ble Minister that there are two ceilings as suspected by this side, for the present and for the future, Then, that will be a great mistake. Our experience in Bombay is when the ceiling bill was introduced in 1955, there was this controversy. The ceiling was not applied to the present holding and so thousands of acres remained with so many people without any ceiling. The result was, those people who had got influence in the Government could approach the village officer and get their names entered in as self-cultivating even though the lands were cultivated by the tenants and the ceiling which was proposed in the Bill was not applicable to those people. They were exempted. Subsequently, when this matter came to the countryside, there was agitation and Government had to pass a subsequent law by which they have raised the ceiling from 12 acres of first class land to 18 acres and it is made applicable to the existing as well as the future holdings. So, I would like to suggest to this Government that there is no use of having one ceiling for one category and another ceiling for another category. Even though I have suggested 15 acres on the basis of Japanese method, we can accept this suggestion of Government to have 18 acres ceiling.

At the same time I want to make a request to the Government. When we are putting a ceiling, we must see that the fertility of the land is increased. It is not the only duty of Government to simply put a ceiling on the land and leave it at that. They must see that the income from that land is increased and the yield is increased for every acre of land. For a double crop, we can get 16,000 lbs. of paddy per acre. That is my personal experience. Fertilisers and other things should be supplied to the cultivators at the proper time; by merely putting a ceiling and not helping them in all these respects, it would be of no benefit. Therefore, I suggest that the other facilities required by the cultivators must be kept in tact and must be made available immediately whenever there is need. Sir, I request that this ceiling

(Sri V. S. PATIL)

of 18 acres is made applicable both for the existing and the future uniformly and that should be accepted.

†Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, I do not propose to make a lengthy speech on this. I only say that this amendment is to hoodwink the commonman who does not understand the implications of this amendment.

Probably the Hon'ble Minister employed the amendment to see that impression was created in order to mislead the people into thinking that Government has reduced the ceiling from 27 to 18 acres. I say this for two reasons. It is already 18 acres in the report. 18 acres is already there for the lands under the cultivation of the tenants, for the lands which the landlord can resume for personal cultivation. 27 acres was there for the lands which are under personal cultivation. So this 18 acres which the amendment refers to, does not relate to the lands which are to be resumed from the tenants. That is one reason. So, this refers only to the lands under personal cultivation of the landlord. secondly, the percentage of land that is under personal cultivation of the owners in the State is 90 per cent. So, this amendment will only refer or apply to 10 per cent of the land in the entire State. It does not apply to the 90 per cent of the land, that is under personal cultivation of the land-owners. This is just to hood-wink they landless people, especially the scheduled class people to think that they will get 50 per cent of the land if this Bill comes into force, this amendment is brought. If this Bill comes into force, they must understand, we do not get any land at all. If this 18 acres is also applied to personal cultivation, than the landlord gets the lands. I was under the impression so far that the Hon'ble Minister is very progressive and revolutionary. This seems to be a false impression going round among the public. I can definitely say it is political exploitation. Sir, we had very high regard for him. I never thought that he would really come forward with this amendment giving out the truth, I would have appreciated him. Even now I request him, I am prepared to support his amendment provided he does not bring any amendment to Clause 63. I am sure he is going to be called reactionary if he brings any amendment. Let not the public be mislead into the belief that this Minister is very revolutionary. People have got a false impression in their mind. The result is, we are seeing this kind of an amendment. If you had said in the beginning itself that this does not apply to lands under personal cultivation, I would have appreciated. When he introduced the amendment, I thought I would be very happy to support him to-day. But his explanation was disappointing. I would request him to bring no amendment to Clause 63.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—Sir, I move a closure motion. I brought to the notice of the Chair, earlier in the day that a time-limit may be fixed. Out of five days allotted, one day has already gone.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Since the closure motion is moved, I will put it to the House.

The question is:

“That the question be now put.”

The motion was adopted.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The trouble has commenced.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—You have commenced the trouble. You have to face it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Well Sir, with due deference to you, you are the at bottom mischief.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Certain Hon'ble Members said that they were confused, surprised, and shocked. I am neither confused nor surprised nor shocked. The amendment is very plain. The amendment seeks to impose a ceiling of 18 standard acres in the definition. There is nothing more for me to add. I am not playing any fraud.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have got a statement to make Sir. Having regard to the attitude of the Ruling Party in respect of this particular matter, we would like to protest and stage a walk-out.

(At this stage, a few Members of the Opposition including the Leader of the Opposition withdrew from the House)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will now put the amendment to the House. The question is:

“That in item (7) of sub-clause (1), for the words “twenty-seven standard acres” the words “Eighteen Standard acres” shall be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment number 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, do not survive. Amendment No. 11.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That in the Explanation to item (10) of sub-clause (1) between the words “to cut grass” and “or to gather” the words or purchases standing or cut grass for the purpose of trade” shall be inserted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That in the Explanation to item (10) of sub-clause (1) between the words “to cut grass” and “or to gather” the words or purchases standing or cut grass for the purpose of trade” shall be inserted.”

(At this stage the Hon'ble Members who had withdrawn from the house, entered the house.)

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, there is an explanation given under the definition to item (10) "to cultivate", which says, that a person who takes up a contract to cut grass, or to gather the fruits or other produce of any land, shall not on that account only be deemed to cultivate such land. In addition to these two categories,—the person who takes up the contract to cut grass or gather fruit or other produce, I should like to add one more category, that is, a person who purchases standing or cut grass for purposes of trade. This should be inserted in addition to the two categories that have already been there. The reason why I have proposed this is that there are many persons living in the countryside who purchase standing grass from land owners and they cut it for purposes of trade. If the agriculturist purchases such grass from the landowners for his own cattle, he should not be on that account debarred. But if a merchant cuts the grass or purchases grass either cut or standing grass, he also should not be deemed to cultivate that particular land. The words entered in the explanation is 'who takes up a contract to cut grass' This is a natural thing. That person might take a contract to cut grass had a certain right. But the person who purchases that grass will not come under that category. In order to obviate or remove any sort of difficulty in the actual working of this Bill, I have made this proposal Sir. That the person who purchases the standing grass which is naturally grown or which is raised by the owner should not be deemed to be cultivator of that land. In order to make this plan, I have made this amendment, as I have come across several cases in which the defect came before the courts for assessing as to whether a person who has purchased standing grass and cuts it and removes it for his own benefit or for purposes of trade, whether he is to be deemed as a cultivator or not.

There are different kinds of rulings. In order to remove all ambiguities I have made this suggestion and I hope the Minister will give due consideration to this and accept. If this amendment is accepted it will give a guidance to the courts in the implementation of this Act.

†**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—I have very carefully examined the amendment. I appreciate the intention with which the amendment is moved, but if it is accepted we will be introducing an element of confusion. Then the question will arise whether a person has taken up a contract for cutting or removing the grass for his own purpose or for the purpose of trade and it will be very difficult to decide that. Several persons who have taken up contracts will plead that they have not taken up the contract for trade but for their own purpose. So if the amendment is accepted it will defeat the very purpose for which this explanation is sought to be inserted. So I request the member to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in the Explanation to item (1) of sub-clause (1) between the words 'to cut grass' and 'or to gather' the

words 'or purchases standing or cut grass for the purpose of trade' shall be inserted."

The amendment was negatived.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I beg to move :

"That in item (11) (iii) of sub-clause (1) for the words 'under the personal supervision of oneself or any member of one's family' the words 'along with the personal labour of oneself or of any member of one's family' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That in item (11) (iii) of sub-clause (1) for the words 'under the personal supervision of oneself or any member of one's family' the words 'along with the personal labour of oneself or of any member of one's family' shall be substituted."

†Sri V. S. PATIL.—This appears to be a simple amendment, but it has got a deep meaning behind it. This is not merely a change of wording, but it has got some meaning. The present definition of "to cultivate personally" is to cultivate land on one's own account (i) by one's own labour, or (ii) by the labour of any member of one's family, or (iii) by hired labour or by servants on wages payable in cash or kind, but not in crop share, under the personal supervision of oneself or any member of one's family. Here for the words "under the personal supervision of oneself or any member of one's family." I want to substitute the words, "along with the personal labour of oneself or of any member of one's family". Under the existing provision a man may stay here in Vidhana Soudha and supervise his lands either at B lgaum or at Bidar or at Jamkhandi. This is the way in which we are implementing this law. Suppose I go to the field, merely see the land and come back or any member of my family goes and sees whether the workers are doing work, pays the wages and comes back, can it be called personal supervision. That is not the real intention with which we are introducing land reforms. We want personal labour of every person or atleast of a member of one's family. Merely sitting at home or riding in a car and just seeing the work going on will not amount to supervision. That is not the intention of land reforms. Land reforms are principally meant for actual work, mental, physical or otherwise and that must be done by the person concerned. Merely because he has got a telephone he cannot reside 100 miles away and see on phone whether the work is going on properly in the fields. This is the kind of work which is now being carried on by landowners and that is the main cause for deterioration of the conditions of agricultural labour and less production in the country. Compared with the production in other countries in the world, production in India is the least. In order to increase our production the landowners must be made to do actual work in the fields. The slogan of our Prime Minister is full of meaning, "Labour is Honourable," "Aaram Haram Huih," but what we actually find here is that "Aaram" is more honoured than work. We

(Sri V. S. PATIL)

have to reverse this idea by introducing land reforms. That is why I have sought to include personal labour in the definition of "to cultivate personally" by my amendment. They must actually participate in the work and not merely supervise by sitting outside. In this connection I may refer to the Report of the Jatti Committee on page 20 in which they have said that in Japan about "18,000 farmers were exempted under a provision enabling owner cultivators to retain land in excess of the 7.35 acres limit if he did not employ hired labour." In Japan if a person uses hired labour he is not allowed any excess land. That is the reason why production in Japan is so high and there is dignity of labour there. We have to introduce such a system here also and I have tried to do that by this amendment.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Do you mean to say that Sri Khot has got to go back and do cultivation ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Yes.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Chief Minister ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Yes. yes.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Mr. Speaker also!

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Yes.

We have come here because we have been elected for a specific period. After that we will go back to the land.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Can you, Mr. Speaker, go back to your lands and participate in cultivation. What do you know of agriculture. You have been in Bombay for 9 years and for 5 years you have been here (*laughter*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not pretend that I am an agriculturist.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—With these remarks I would request the Government to accept my amendment which is simple and yet which is of fundamental importance.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The definition incorporated in the Bill has been adopted from the recommendations of the Planning Commission. This is the definition adopted by several other States too. Supervision involves personal effort and labour. Therefore there is no need for the amendment suggested by my friend, Mr. V. S. Patil.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is.

"That in item (11) (iii) of sub-clause (1) for the words 'under the personal Supervision of one-Self or any Member of one's family' the words 'along with the personal labour of oneself or of any Member of one's family' shall be substituted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now amendments Nos. 13 to 16 may be moved.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I beg to move.

“That to item (11) of sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added.

Provided the person supervising resides in the village during the main agricultural season”.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved.

“That to item (11) of sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added.—

Provided the person supervising resides in the village during the main agricultural season”.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I beg to move.

“That to item (11) of sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added.—

Provided the owner resides in the village and within a distance of ten miles radius from the land, atleast during the main agricultural season”.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved.

“That to item (11) of sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added.—

Provided the owner resides in the village and within a distance of ten miles radius from the land, atleast during the main agricultural season”.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before **Sri V. S. Patil** moves his amendment, I wish to draw his attention that the latter part of his amendment “reading and also contributes his personal labour in cultivating the land” cannot be moved by him, because it has already been rejected by the House.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I beg to move.

“That to item (11) of sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added.—

Provided that the person exercising such personal supervision resides within a radius of not more than 10 miles from the land”.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That to item (11) of sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added.—

Provided that the person exercising such personal supervision resides within a radius of not more than 10 miles from the land”.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I beg to move.

“That after item (11) (iii) of sub-clause (1) the following item shall be added.—

(iv) and resides within a distance of 6 miles from the land in question or from the village within which the land is situated”.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That after item (11) (iii) of sub-clause (1) the following item shall be added.—

(iv) and resides within a distance of 6 miles from the land in question or from the village within which the land is situated”.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The amendment moved by me is a simple one and is not controversial. It is also in accordance with the suggestion made by the Central Committee on Land Reforms. If the amendment is not accepted, it would lead to ridiculous consequences. A man may live in Delhi and claim to supervise lands in Mysore. It would defeat the purpose with which we are enacting this law. Therefore it is desirable that at least during the main agricultural season, a person supposed to supervise agricultural operations, must be residing in the particular village or in the immediate neighbourhood. Of course it does not mean he should actually live on his land. There may be some reason for rejecting the amendment of Mr. V. S. Patil because he had insisted on personal labour. Here I only suggest that at the time agricultural operations take place, the landowner should be physically present.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I do not intend making a long speech on this amendment. The very idea is to see that absentee landlordism is discouraged or eliminated as far as possible. Unless the landlord or his agent or supervisor resides there at least during the main agricultural season. There is no point in saying that we have reached our objective. I would only invite the attention of the Hon'ble Revenue Minister to the recommendations made by the Planning Commission itself. They recommended “that personal supervision in regard to the owners desiring to resume land from the tenant should be defined to include residence in the village during the main agricultural season on the part of the cultivator or a Member of his family. It was further suggested that adequate sanction should be provided for the enforcement of this condition.” I am quite willing even to get a further amendment to my amendment so as to make any Member of the family reside within a distance of ten miles. The whole idea of the amendment is to see that absentee landlordism is eliminated. The Bill, as it is, seems to encourage and not to eliminate this practice.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—A person residing in a village may acquire lands 10 or 15 miles away. Do you expect him to reside in the new place.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The whole idea is that he should show an interest in his land by being there. An I. C. S. officer residing in Delhi may have property in Mysore. How is personal supervision possible in his case. Neither himself nor any Member of his family will reside within a radius of 10 miles. My amendment seeks to prevent such contingencies.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—There seems to be some confusion here. The words “cultivate personally” applies to landlords. What is sought to be included now is that he should reside personally on the land and personally participate in the agricultural operations and reside within 10 miles. The word tenant is defined in sub-clause 34.

Does this obligation to reside on the land, cultivate personally or reside within ten miles or be there and supervise personally, apply to tenant also or to the land lord alone. There seems to be no objection to a tenant to be absent from the land and get it cultivated through servants or be present there only during the season. There is some lacuna in the whole provision. It is a very welcome feature no doubt, but the tenant also escapes. This is a lacuna which I wanted to point out to the House. Both these things may be considered.

†Sri V. S. PATIL.—The main reason why we have brought these amendments is that now-a-days when land owners come to know or are convinced that is they don't cultivate lands, they will have to surrender them to the Government and to avoid this, all these land lords or land-holders, at least 90 per cent of them have taken karars or agreements from the actual tenants to the effect that they are their servants, they are their servants, they are their hired labour and on the strength of those documents, these land owners are now deemed according to the law to be personal cultivators, wherever they might be residing. The land owner may be residing at Bangalore and if he has got a document in his pocket from the tenant and if that document or agreement is with him, that would be more than sufficient for him to say that he has cultivated the land personally. This mischief is being played throughout our country and this is one of the ways which has been invented by the land owning class to evade the provisions of the land reforms. It is known to everybody and I do not think that our Government is ignorant of it. By these means, the very purpose for which this Bill is being introduced and legislations have been passed in our country, has been defeated and there should not be any way or scope for such things being done in future. It is not we that introduced it. It was there in the original Bill. The distance may be five miles, six miles or ten miles; but it should be within easy reach of a person to supervise the cultivation of the land and that is why we have again tried to introduce the original clause in the Bill. In the Select Committee it has been deleted and that deletion will certainly come in the way of efficient cultivation of the land. That is why we have proposed it and if the Government has got any real intention to see that the productivity of the land

(Sri V. S. Patil)

is improved or the yield of the land is increased, then I think they will accept the amendment as they themselves had proposed it in the original Bill and if they don't want to see that the landed class at their back is to be favoured.

†Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—In support of this amendment, I want to advance a few points. In essence, this amendment is based on two aspects. The first aspect is the elimination of the absentee landlord; the second is the augmentation of food production. Naturally if the landlord or the land holder resides away from the spot, the incentive will be neutralised. Then object of this Bill will also be neutralised. Therefore, it is better to insist upon the landlord to reside within a reasonable distance so as to exercise more effective supervision for the production of foodgrains. Therefore, I think it is but right for Government to accept this amendment as it contributes quite a good lot for the augmentation of food production and for the elimination of absentee landlords.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ (ತುಮಕೂರು).—ಮನೂದೆಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಏತಕ್ಕೊಂದರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇರುವ ಸ್ಥಳದಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ದೂರವಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಬೇಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿದೆಂದು ನಂಬಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಆರು ಮೈಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಮೂರು ಮೈಲಿ ಅಂತರವೊಳಗೆ ವಾಸಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಬೇಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಮತ್ತೆ ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ದಿನಾಲು ಹೋಗಿ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರಸ್ತೆಬೇಕು ಕಾರ್ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕು, ಬಸ್ ರೂಟ್ ಆದರೂ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಸಹ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೂರವಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮೈಲಿ ಅಂತರದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಬೇಸಾಯ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಮನೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯ ಪ್ರಾಪಿಜನ್ ಸಹ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಹತ್ತು ಮೈಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸಹ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಐದು ಮೈಲಿ ಅಂತರವಿರುವವಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ಮೈಲಿ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಮೈಸೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅನುಭವವಿರತಕ್ಕಂತ ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣನವರು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮೈಲಿ ಅಳತೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಆರು ಮೈಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ವಾಸ್ತವಿಕವಾಗಿ ಹತ್ತು ಹದಿನೈದು ಮೈಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೆ. ಇಷ್ಟತ್ತು ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರವಿದ್ದು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರು ನಮ್ಮ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜನಗರ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗುವ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಳುಗಡೆಯಾಗಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಬೇರಕಡೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ನಗರವಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಷ್ಟತ್ತು ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರವಿರುವ ಭೂಮಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥ ನೂರಾರು ನಂಸಾರಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ತೋರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಇಂದಿಗೂ ಅವರು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಉಚಿತವೂ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೇ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಿಯು ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾರ್ಕೆಡು ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರವಿರುವ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಮಿಯು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಣ್ಣೆವಾಗಿ ತರ

ಭೂಮಿಯು ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇರುವುದು ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ, ವಾಸಮಾಡುವುದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಎಳೆಂಟು ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರ ಹೋಗಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ಕೂಡ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯವನ್ನೇ ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಮನೂವೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯ ಹತ್ತು ಮೈಲಿ ಅಂತರ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಷರತ್ತನ್ನು ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಾದರೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಒಹಳ ಕೊಂದಾಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂಸಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವರು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯವನ್ನೇ ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ 15-20 ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರವಿರುವ ಜಮೀನು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಧರ್ಮ ಅಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಜನರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟೇಲ್ಲದ ಅನೇಕ ಬೆಚ್ಚರಾಕ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಗೆ, ಅಂಥ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಜನರು ಬೇರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಬೆಚ್ಚರಾಕ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಭೂಮಿಯ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಬೆಚ್ಚರಾಕ ಗ್ರಾಮವಿರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸ ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕುಷ್ಟ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಪಕ್ಕದ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳ ಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಫ್ಯೂನಿಂಗ್ ಫಂಡ್‌ನ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್‌ಅನ್ನು ಸಹ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಯಾವ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ಶಂಕರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಸಮರ್ಗ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು support ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಷ್ಪಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅನುಭವ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮನುಷ್ಯನು ಬೇಗಗೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಮೊದಲನೇ ಕೆಲಸ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ನೋಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾನೆ. 20 ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರವಿದ್ದು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಂಥ ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದಿನಾಲು ಅಂಥವನು ಹೇಗೆ ಹೇಗುತ್ತಾನೆ? ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಜಮೀನು ಹತ್ತಿರವಿದ್ದು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಂಟುಹತ್ತು ಮೈಲಿ ಅಂತರವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂಥ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರನು ಹೇಗೋ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the original bill there is a provision to the effect that the person who supervises the cultivation would reside within the radius of ten miles. This provision was discussed in the Select Committee and it was unanimously decided that there should not be this restriction. It was a unanimous decision and there is no dissenting note on that point.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—On a point of order Sir? Sir, there is no question of a dissenting note on this or otherwise. What took place in the Select Committee is confidential and the speeches or anything that has happened there are all treated as confidential. The point of order is, whether the Hon'ble Minister can disclose what has happened there in this open House?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I referred only to the decision as printed in the report of the Select Committee. There is no dissent on that point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When there is no dissenting note, it automatically means that it has been unanimously decided.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—He should not say what has happened in the Select Committee.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Sir, there may not be a dissenting note but there is the possibility of vote having been taken on this point.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I said, there is no dissent on that point. It is presumed that it is an unanimous decision.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Naturally.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, certain matters were decided by putting the matter to vote. Therefore, let the Hon'ble Minister be a bit careful when he refers to the decisions of the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What was said how that there has no dissenting note on this matter and then it was a unanimous decision.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, for the reasons mentioned by Sri Puttaswamy and for other reasons, the Government have come to the conclusion that there should be no restriction. There is no need for this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment of Sri G. Venkatai Gowda. The question is:

“That to item (11) of sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added:—

“Provided the person supervising resides in the village during the main agriculture season.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment of Sri Mallaradhya. The question is:

“That to item (11) sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added:—

“Provided the owner resides in the village and within a distance of ten miles radius from the land, at least during main agricultural season.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment of Sri V. S. Patil. The question is:

“That to item 11 of sub-clause (1) the following proviso shall be added:—

“Provided that the person exercising such personal supervision resides within a radius of not more than 10 miles from the land and also contributes his personal labour in cultivating the land.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 16. The question is:

“That after item (11) (iii) of sub-clause (1) the following item shall be added:—

“(iv) and resides within a distance of 6 miles from the land in question or from the village within which the land is situated.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the House will rise and meet to-morrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Friday, the 8th September 1961.
